

## REMARKS

The Examiner objects to the disclosure as containing an embedded hyperlink on page 2, line 26. Correction is included herein.

The Examiner objects to the drawings as missing proper legends. FIG. 1 has been amended to add the following legends: "First Message" to line 108, "Second Message" to line 110, "Results Message" to line 112 and "Request Operations Message" to line 114. Corrected drawings are submitted herewith.

Claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6665530 (Broyles) in view of US 2001/0025345 (Jung). Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broyles as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Jung and US 2003/0048764 (Diep). Claim 4 has been cancelled, thus mooting the rejection of that claim. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broyles as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Jung and US 6591364 (Patel).

Claim 1 has been amended. Applicant submits that neither Broyles, nor Jung, separately or in combination, teach the amended claim 1 limitation of "determining whether to initiate call setup for the mobile station prior to the second authentication procedure completing successfully." As the Examiner states on page 3 of the Office Action, Broyles teaches on column 6, line 26 to column 8, line 7 that the mobile station's access is delayed until the unique challenge authentication is completed successfully. In other words, Broyles teaches an authentication process whereby in all cases call setup is not initiated until the authentication procedure has completed successfully. See Broyles FIG. 4 and the accompanying text. Broyles also states that in the case where the infrastructure components previously received the same security information from the mobile station, the infrastructure components will require additional verification of the identity of the mobile station before that mobile station will be allowed access to the system. (See col. 6, lines 44-50). Thus, Broyles' teachings are contrary to Applicant's claim 1 in that a determination is made whether to initiate call setup setup prior to the second authentication procedure completing successfully.

Regarding amended claims 2 and 3, Applicants submit that none of the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, teaches the novel combination of steps recited. In particular, none of the references cited teaches the network determining timing for initiating call set up for a mobile station based on results of a first authentication procedure.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is allowable over the art cited. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 2-3 and 5-6 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on claim 1 and for the reasons stated above (claims 2-3). Applicant requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,  
Carey, Christopher et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department

Customer Number: **22917**

By   
Lalita W. Pace  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 39,427  
Telephone: 847-538-5855  
Fax: 847-576-3750